



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,324	09/21/2005	Jean-Christophe Galland	RN02100	9177

7590 12/27/2007
RHODIA INC
CN 7500
8 CEDAR BROOK DRIVE
CRANBURY, NJ 08512

EXAMINER

KOSACK, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,324

Applicant(s)

GALLAND ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph Kosack

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 48 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 25-48 are pending in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 25-46) in the reply filed on October 12, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that some of the groups are easily searchable and that no classification has been set out. This is not found persuasive because these factors are ***not*** considered for a lack of unity requirement under 35 U.S.C. 372. However, the traversal that the requirement was overly restrictive was found to be persuasive, and the following subgenus has been searched:

L1 is S;

R1-R4 are optionally substituted phenyl rings;

T and T1 are phosphorus;

U1-U4 are oxygen;

n is 0;

and R5 and R6 are optionally substituted phenyl rings.

Additionally, claims 47-48 were searched with the same subgenus above and are examined in the instant application. The non-searched portions of claims 25-48 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Priority

The claim to priority as a 371 of PCT/FR03/02191, filed July 11, 2003, which claims priority to FR 02/08904, filed July 15, 2002 has been acknowledged in the instant application.

Claim Objections

Claims 25-48 are objected to for containing elected and non-elected subject matter. The elected subject matter has been identified supra.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 25-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In the instant case, a process for hydrocyanating a hydrocarbon compound containing at least one ethylenic unsaturation using a catalyst comprising a transition metal and an organic ligand of formula I is claimed. The specification only provides support for using Ni(cod)₂ as the transition metal compound in the catalyst composition for the instant process. With the vast array of transition metal starting materials that can be included in the catalyst composition, e.g. TiO₂, FeCl₂, FeCl₃, Mn(acac)₃, etc..., Applicant has not provided a representative number of examples which leads one of

skill to conclude that Applicant was not in possession of the entire claimed invention at the time of filing. Applicant can overcome this rejection either by providing declaration evidence or by deleting the subject matter that does not have firm written description support in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102


The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuliev (CAS Accession Number 1964:67371).

Kuliev teaches a compound of the formula:



which reads on the claims

where L1 is S; R1-R4 are optionally substituted phenyl rings; T and T1 are phosphorus;

U1-U4 are oxygen; n is 0; and R5 and R6 are optionally substituted phenyl rings. See the attached reference.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 25-46 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,253,298. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to the same art specific subject matter.

The instant claims overlap with the '298 claims, especially where L1 is SO₂. As this is part of the non-elected subject matter in the instant claims, this matter either should be deleted to overcome the rejection or a terminal disclaimer may be filed.


Conclusion


Claims 25-47 are rejected. Claims 25-48 are objected to.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Kosack whose telephone number is (571)-272-5575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 A.M. until 4:00 P.M. The examiner has every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph M^cKane can be reached on (571)-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Joseph Kosack
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626


REBECCA ANDERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Joseph K. M^cKane
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626